UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,626	03/24/2004	Simone Arrigo	19414-08962	7482

758 7590 07/26/2006

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
SHENG, TOM V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,626	ARRIGO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tom V. Sheng	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 March 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-76* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-25,27,29,31,33 and 35-76* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3,26,28,30,32,34* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/29/04,2/28/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 11, 54 and 75 are objected to because of the following informalities:

For claim 11 line 2, claim 54 line 2, and claim 75 line 2, "an image" should be changed to "images" since comparison involves at least two objects. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 52-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As for claim 52, the disclosure, as filed, does not contain sufficient information as to the claimed feature, lines 21-22, "in response to receiving third activity data, transitioning to the second power consumption mode" during the third power consumption mode. The disclosure (see fig. 2 and 3 and at least paragraph 51), clearly teaches transitioning from any low power mode to only the run mode 205 when a

corresponding activity is detected. That is, the disclosure only teaches transitioning from the third power consumption mode (sleep mode of fig. 2 or hibernate mode of fig. 3) to the first power consumption mode (run mode) when corresponding third activity data is received. Claims 53-68 are dependent on claim 52.

As for claim 69, the disclosure, as filed, does not contain sufficient information as to the claimed feature, lines 7-9, "in response to receiving the first activity data, transitioning to the second power consumption mode, wherein the second power consumption mode consumes more power than the first power consumption mode" during the first power consumption mode. To clarify the record, claim 69 is the reverse of claim 52, in that claim 69 is describing a power-up sequence versus claim 52, which describes a power-down sequence. As analyzed with respect to claim 52, when a corresponding activity is detected, only the run mode is transitioned to, not any other intermediate mode. That is, the disclosure only teaches transitioning from the first power consumption mode (sleep mode of fig. 2 or hibernate mode of fig. 3) to the third power consumption mode (run mode) when corresponding first activity data is received. Claims 70-76 are dependent on claim 69.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 44 recites the limitation "the user" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19-22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 35, 38 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Junod et al. (US 5,854,621), hereinafter Junod.

As for clam 7, Junod teaches a method of managing power consumption of a wireless device (wireless mouse 10; fig. 1) having a plurality of power consumption modes (normal, standby and sleep modes; column 6 lines 37-40), the method comprising:

in a first power consumption mode (normal mode):

operating the wireless device at a fist power level (opto-mechanical encoders 300, 310 operating at full speed; fig. 4; column 6 lines 40-44),

in response to receiving a first activity data, maintaining the first power consumption mode (i.e. when the mouse is being used), and

in response to receiving no activity data for a time period associated with the first power consumption mode (after a period of nonuse; column 6 line 44), transitioning to a second power consumption mode (enters standby mode; column 6 lines 45-46);

in the second power consumption mode (standby mode):

operating the wireless device at a second power level that is less than the first power level (opto-mechanical encoders sampling at a lower speed; column 6 lines 45-48),

in response to receiving a second activity data (checking for activity such as movement of the mouse, depression of a button or depression of the channel program button; column 6 lines 61-63), transitioning to the first power consumption mode (returns to normal mode; column 6 lines 64-65), and

in response to receiving no second activity data for a time period associated with the second power consumption mode (after a further period of nonuse; column 6 lines 50-51), transitioning to a third power consumption mode (enters sleep mode; column 6 line 51); and

in the third power consumption mode (sleep mode):

operating the wireless device at a third power level that is less than the second power level (CPU 320 enters stop mode with remaining circuitry enters full static condition; column 6 lines 52-53), and

in response to receiving a third activity data (checking for activity such as movement of the mouse, depression of a button or depression of the channel program button; column 6 lines 61-63), transitioning to the first power consumption mode (returns to normal mode; column 6 lines 64-65). See also fig. 5 and column 6 line 66 through column 7 line 21.

As for claims 8 and 10, Junod teaches detecting movement of the mouse by means of opto-mechanical encoders 300, 310 (analyzed above) that corresponds to claimed motion detection.

As for claims 14, 15, 43, 44, Junod also teaches using depression of a button on the wireless mouse 10 as an activity (column 6 lines 61-65) that corresponds to claimed user input.

As for claim 17, 45, Junod teaches that only when activity is detected would the CPU 320 returns to normal mode from either standby or sleep mode (column 6 lines 60-65). Thus, without a third activity data, the third power consumption mode is maintained.

As for claims 19, 21 and 22, Junod teaches that during the standby (second) mode, the opto-encoders 300, 310 are sampled less frequently and further PLL circuitry 350-390 and RF amplifier 420 may be switched off (column 6 lines 44-50). Thus, the opto-encoders correspond to a power consuming module where power is decreased and the PLL circuitry or the RF amplifier corresponds to another power consuming module where power is shut off.

As for claim 20, Junod teaches that during the sleep (third) mode, the CPU 320 enters a stop mode that corresponds to claimed powering down a second power consuming module (first module being the opto-mechanical encoders).

Claim 24 is rejected per analysis of claim 7 with the opto-mechanical encoders 300, 310 operating at full speed, lower speed and wake-up rate (column 6 lines 37-65) correspond to claimed querying at a first average polling rate, a second average polling

rate that is lower than the first average polling rate, and a third average polling rate that is lower than the second average polling rate.

As for claims 25, 27 and 29, the image sampling at the respective rates analyzed in claim 24 correspond to the claimed capturing of one image during each poll.

As for claims 35, 38, Junod teaches the checking for activities such as movement of the mouse, which corresponds to claimed motion detection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 9, 11-13, 16, 18, 23, 31, 33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junod as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Frank (US 5,457,478).

As for claims 9, 11, 31, 33, 36-37, 39-40, Junod's motion detection is performed by means of a ball 200, photosource 300 and photodetectors 310. The rotation of the ball 200 is converted into digital signal by means of the opto-mechanical encoders 300, 310 directly representative of the movement of the mouse (column 5 lines 1-5 and 54-63). Thus, Junod does not teach determining motion detection through a comparison of images on a photosensor. On the other hand, Junod teaches that other means of

detecting mouse movement is possible, and in particular, mentions the use of a photo detector array (column 5, lines 5-10).

Frank teaches a control device 30 (figure 2) that normally acts as a cursor control device. Input signals are received via input optics 38 (figure 2), furthermore signals are decoded into position data by a decoder 36 (figure 2) and sent to a host computer 34 (column 4, lines 6-57). Frank further teaches how the input signals are read as images (by means of a photosensitive cell array), and by comparing the images (i.e. the image difference or all pixel differences) the direction and distance of movement would be known (figure 7, column 9 line 10 to column 10 line 9). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Frank's direction and movement detection correspond to claimed motion detection.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Frank's input optics and decoder in the place of Junod's ball and opto-mechanical encoders, since Junod mentions the use of photo detector array and because Frank's input optics and decoder provide enhanced reliability to Junod's ball and opto-mechanical encoders by eliminating mechanical components.

As for claim 12, each photosensitive cell of the sensor array 148 corresponds to a pixel and an image difference correspond naturally to a change of pixel.

As for claim 13, 41 and 42, Junod does not teach using interferometric techniques in motion detection. Official Notice is taken of both the concept and advantage in using interferometry in motion detection as being well known in the art. It

would have been obvious to use interferometry for motion detection as a functional equivalent choice to the use of image sensor array.

As for claim 16, Junod does not teach the use of a wheel for user input. On the other hand, a wheel is a well-known alternative to the middle button of Junod. It would have been obvious to substitute the middle button with a wheel whenever scrolling function is also intended for a mouse.

As for claim 18, 46, Junod does not teach claimed fourth power consumption mode. On the other hand, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a fourth power consumption mode whenever an additional power consumption level is desired and manageable, if this additional level provides further power saving without overly complicates the power control means.

As for claim 23, 51, neither Junod nor Frank teaches that the wireless device is a mobile phone, text messager or a personal digital assistant. On the other hand, the power saving system of Junod's wireless mouse as modified by Frank is well understood to be applicable to other wireless device such as a mobile phone. That is, the power saving of a mobile phone can similarly be based on the differences between images taken by the phone's built-in camera.

Claims 47-50 are rejected per analysis of claims 19, 21 and 22.

10. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank (US 5,457,478) in view of Junod et al. (US 5,854,621).

As for apparatus claim 1 and associated method claim 6, Frank teaches an optical sensing assembly (input optics 38 and decoder 36; fig. 2) for a computer input device (control device 30) configured to receive power from a power source (during a cursor control mode, transmitter 44 of control device 30 receives power from a constant power source; fig. 8; column 11 lines 5-10), the optical sensing assembly for characterizing movement relative to the optical sensing assembly (in the cursor control mode, position data is generated by decoder 36 based on movement of control device 30 on reflective pad 46; fig. 2; column 4 lines 39-39-44 and 50-57) and comprising:

a photo-sensitive element (sensor array 148 of input optics 38; fig. 7; column 8 lines 34-42) configured to receive reflected light from a light source (receive external signals from reflective pad 46; column 8 lines 22-25) to produce a first image data associated with a first image (a first bit map image is generated based on an illumination of the sensor array 148; column 9 lines 10-16) and a second image data associated with a second image (after the first bit map image is transferred out, a second bit map image will be generated; column 9 lines 48-50);

an image data processing logic (coordinate generator 154 containing a comparison means and a look-up table; column 9 lines 50-52) coupled to the photo-sensitive element (as shown in fig. 7 from sensor array 148 to coordinate generator 154 via a bit map imager 152) for receiving the image data (inherent) and configured to determine image difference data from differences between the first image data and the second image data (look-up code indicating differences between the first bit map image and the second bit map image is generated; column 9 lines 52-65). That is, the

coordinate generator 154 provides direction and distance moved for updating the cursor, during the cursor control mode.

Frank is silent on whether the power source provided to the control device 30 is self-contained or comes from outside. On the other hand, Frank teaches that the control device 30 is to be operated as both a cursor control device and a remote control device. Since at least the remote control devices are well known to be self-powered by means of a battery, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to similarly incorporate a battery inside the control device so as to make it self-powered, the advantage being its movement not restricted by a wire in the case of external power provision.

Still, Frank does not teach a power control logic operatively coupled to the image data processing logic and configured to implement a native power control mode wherein an internal algorithm changes the power consumption of the optical sensing assembly from a full power mode to one or more lower power modes based on the image difference data.

Junod teaches a battery-powered wireless mouse 10 (fig. 1 and 2; column 2 lines 20-22). Specifically, Junod teaches that under normal operation, after a period of nonuse or lack of activity, the mouse 10 will enter a standby mode, during which the opto-mechanical encoders (300, 310; fig. 4) will be sampled less frequently (column 6; lines 32-53). Moreover, if any activity does occur (i.e. movement of the mouse, depression of a button, etc.), the mouse returns to normal mode (column 6 lines 53-65).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the control of different power modes (normal, standby and sleep) corresponds to claimed power control logic and the standby mode corresponds to claimed one lower power mode. Further, by incorporating Junod's energy conserving method into Frank's control device, the battery life of the device would be advantageously extended. Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate Junod's power controlling method into Frank's self-powered control device, as it would advantageously extend the operating time of the control device between changing of batteries.

As for claim 2, Frank teaches that the photosensitive cells of the sensor array 148 may be photo diodes (column 8 lines 37-39).

As for claim 4, Frank teaches that the input optics 38 contains a lens for focusing the external signal (column 7 lines 28-33).

As for claim 5, the look-up code indicating the difference between the first bit map image and the second bit map image is generated and is then referred to the look-up table to generate a control code indicating the direction and distance of the movement of the control device (column 9 lines 58-65).

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 3, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior arts of record teaches the limitations

"wherein the photo sensitive element is a CCD array having a set of pixels and the image data comprises a bit vector corresponding to a set of states of the set of pixels" of claim 3,

"wherein querying for the first activity data comprises capturing a plurality of images during each poll at the first average polling rate" of claim 26,

"wherein querying for the second activity data comprises capturing a plurality of images during each poll at the second average polling rate" of claim 28,

"wherein querying for the third activity data comprises capturing a plurality of images during each poll at the third average polling rate" of claim 30,

"capturing a plurality of images during a single poll" of claim 32, and

"capturing, during a single poll, a plurality of images" of claim 34.

Specifically, the sampling of images by modified Junod could be broadly interpreted as capturing one image per poll, but it would not read on capturing of plural images per poll.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom V. Sheng whose telephone number is (571) 272-7684. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tom Sheng
July 10, 2006

AMR A. AWAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER